

LAW OFFICES
BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC

TWO BALA PLAZA, SUITE 510
BALA CYNWYD, PA 19004

610.667.6200
FAX 610.667.9029
www.brodsky-smith.com

NEW JERSEY OFFICE
1040 KINGS HIGHWAY NORTH, STE 601
CHERRY HILL, NJ 08034
856.795.7250

NEW YORK OFFICE
240 MINEOLA BOULEVARD
MINEOLA, NY 11501
516.741.4977

CALIFORNIA OFFICE
9595 WILSHIRE BLVD., SUITE 900
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212
877.534.2590

November 30, 2016

Owner Cosas Baratas 5616 Santa Monica Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90038	Owner/President/CEO Tai Sheng Plastic Toys Laimei Industrial Zone Chenghai District Shantou City Guangdong Province China
Owner/President/CEO Sheng Tai Toys Ltd. 1, Kaki bukit Road 2 #03-07 Singapore 417835	Owner/President/CEO Tai Sheng Plastic Toys Via E-mail: ts@taishengtoy.com

AND THE PUBLIC PROSECUTORS LISTED ON THE DISTRIBUTION LIST ACCOMPANYING
THE ATTACHED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Re: Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5, *et seq.*

To Whom It May Concern:

Brodsky & Smith, LLC (“Brodsky Smith”) represents Karen Calacin (“Calacin”), a citizen of the State of California acting in the interest of the general public to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals in products sold in California and to improve human health by reducing hazardous substances contained in such items.

With respect to the product identified below, Karen Calacin has identified a violation of California’s Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (“Proposition 65”), which is codified at Cal. Health & Safety Code §25249.5, *et seq.* This violation has occurred and continues to occur because the alleged Violator(s) identified below failed to provide required clear and reasonable warnings with this product. Section 25249.6 of the statute provides that “[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the State to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individual ...” Without proper warnings regarding the toxic effects of exposures to this listed chemical that results from contact with this product, California citizens lack the information necessary to make an informed decision on whether and/or how to eliminate (or reduce) their risk of exposure to the listed chemical from the reasonably foreseeable use of the product.

Please allow this letter to serve as notice of this violation to the alleged Violators and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to Section 25249.7(d) of the statute, Brodsky Smith intends to file a private enforcement action on behalf of Karen Calacin sixty (60) days after effective service of this notice unless the public enforcement agencies¹ have commenced and are earnestly prosecuting an action to redress these violations.

Alleged Violator(s): The name of the company's covered by this notice that Violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter "the Violators") are:

Cosas Baratas
Tai Sheng Plastic Toys
Sheng Tai Toys Ltd.

Product Category/Type: The specific type of product causing this violation is:

<i>Product</i>	<i>Retailer(s)</i>	<i>Manufacturer(s)/Distributor(s)</i>
Diving Outfit Goggles Item#76029 UPC#7-81357-76029-7	Cosas Baratas	Tai Sheng Plastic Toys Sheng Tai Toys Ltd.

Listed Chemicals: This violation involves exposure to the chemical Diisononyl phthalate (DINP). On December 20, 2013, the State of California listed Diisononyl phthalate (DINP) as a chemical known to cause cancer. This addition took place more than twelve (12) months before Calacin served this notice.

Violations: The alleged Violators knowingly and intentionally have exposed and continue to knowingly and intentionally expose consumers within the State of California to Diisononyl phthalate (DINP) without providing clear and reasonable warning of this exposure. In particular, the product does not warn that it contains chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer.

Route of Exposure: The exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the purchase, acquisition, handling and recommended use of the product. Consequently, the primary route of exposure to these chemicals is through direct contact. Of particular concern with this product is that it is intended for use by young children (age 3 and up). As the analyzed black plastic portion of these goggles is in direct contact with a user's face and nose, direct skin exposure is likely to occur. During normal, expected use the goggles will become wet and skin permeation rates can potentially increase as aqueous HMWP skin permeation rates are faster than neat HMWP permeation. Not only is direct skin exposure likely, but vapor phase DINP is likely to be generated within the enclosed area surrounding the wearer's eyes that may cause eye irritation. Systemic exposure is possible through exposure to phthalate vapors inside the enclosed area of the goggles resulting in intraocular absorption and transport to other parts of the body. The eyes are particularly sensitive to chemicals. For instance, decreased human corneal endothelial cell line B4G12 proliferation was observed for phthalates including DBP, BBP, and DEHP, and cell toxicity was observed for DBP and BBP. DINP vapor potentially may be inhaled due to the proximity of the black plastic of the goggles to the nose and mouth of the wearer. Finally, while mouthing of the product does not seem likely, some amount of exposure through ingestion can occur by handling the product with subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth.

Duration of the Violations: Each of these ongoing violations has occurred on every day since at least August 3, 2016; as well as every day since the product was introduced to the California marketplace and following the one-year anniversary date of the listing at issue; and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until this known toxic chemical is removed from the product.

¹ The public enforcement agencies that have been served with copies of this notice of violations are identified in the attached distribution list accompanying the Certificate of Service.

Pursuant to Title 11, C.C.R. §3100, a certificate of merit is attached hereto. Pursuant to Title 27, C.C.R. §25903(b), a copy of "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Action of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary" is also enclosed.

Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and desire to have these ongoing violations of California law quickly rectified, Ms. Calacin is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter without engaging in costly and protracted litigation.

Karen Calacin has retained me as legal counsel in connection with this matter. **Please direct all communications regarding this Notice of Violations to my attention at the law office address and telephone number indicated on the letterhead.**

Sincerely,



Evan J. Smith

Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Action of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of 18 years of age, and am not a party to the within action. My business address is 2 Bala Plaza, Suite 510, Bala Cynwyd, Pennsylvania. I am employed in Montgomery County where the mailing occurred.

On November 30, 2016, I served the following documents: **Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5, et seq.; Certificate of Merit; The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Action of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary** on the following entities and individuals listed below by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to the person or entity listed below and depositing it in a US Postal Service Office with postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Owner Cosas Baratas 5616 Santa Monica Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90038	Owner/President/CEO Tai Sheng Plastic Toys Laimei Industrial Zone Chenghai District Shantou City Guangdong Province China
Owner/President/CEO Sheng Tai Toys Ltd. 1, Kaki bukit Road 2 #03-07 Singapore 417835	Owner/President/CEO Tai Sheng Plastic Toys Via Email: ts@taishengtoy.com

On November 30, 2016, I served the following documents: **Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5, et seq.; Certificate of Merit; The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Action of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary** on each of the individuals on the service list attached hereto as Appendix B by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to the person or entity listed below and depositing it in a US Postal Service Office with postage fully prepaid for delivery by Priority Mail.

Executed on November 30, 2016, in Bala Cynwyd, Pennsylvania.




Evan J. Smith

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT
Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7(d)

I, Evan J. Smith, hereby declare:

- (1) This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached sixty-day notice in which it is alleged the parties identified in the notice have violated Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.
- (2) I am the attorney for the noticing party, Karen Calacin.
- (3) I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who has reviewed facts, studies or other data regarding the alleged exposure to the listed chemicals that are the subject of the action.
- (4) Based on the information obtained through these consultations, and on all other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiffs' case can be established and the information did not prove that the alleged violator(s) will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.
- (5) The copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General attaches to it factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including information identified in Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: November 30, 2016



Evan J. Smith
Attorney for Karen Calacin

SERVICE LIST

The Honorable Nancy O'Malley
Alameda County District Attorney
1225 Fallon Street, Room 900
Oakland, CA 94612

The Honorable Terese Drabec
Alpine County District Attorney
270 Laramie Street, PO BOX 248
Markleeville, CA 96120

The Honorable Todd Riebe
Amador County District Attorney
708 Court Street
Jackson, CA 95642

The Honorable Michael Ramsey
Butte County District Attorney
25 County Center Drive
Oroville, CA 95965

The Honorable Barbara Yook
Calaveras County District Attorney
891 Mountain Ranch Road
San Andreas, CA 95249

The Honorable John Poyner
Colusa County District Attorney
346 Fifth Street
Colusa, CA 95932

The Honorable Mark Peterson
Contra Costa County District Attorney
900 Ward Street
Martinez, CA 94553

The Honorable Dale Trigg
Del Norte County District Attorney
450 H Street, Room 171
Crescent City, CA 95531

The Honorable Vern Pierson
El Dorado County District Attorney
515 Main Street
Placerville, CA 95667

The Honorable Lisa Smittcamp
Fresno County District Attorney
2220 Tulare Street, #1000
Fresno, CA 93721

The Honorable Dwayne Stewart
Glenn County District Attorney
P.O. Box 430
Willows, CA 95988

The Honorable Maggie Fleming
Humboldt County District Attorney
825 5th Street, Fourth Floor
Eureka, CA 95501

The Honorable Gilbert Otero
Imperial County District Attorney
940 West Main Street, Suite 102
El Centro, CA 92243

The Honorable Thomas Hardy
Inyo County District Attorney
168 North Edwards Street
Independence, CA 93526

The Honorable Lisa Green
Kern County District Attorney
1215 Truxtun Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301

The Honorable Keith Fagundas
Kings County District Attorney
1400 West Lacey Boulevard
Hanford, CA 93230

The Honorable Donald Anderson
Lake County District Attorney
255 North Forbes Street
Lakeport, CA 95453

The Honorable Stacey Montgomery
Lassen County District Attorney
220 South Lassen Street, Ste. 8
Susanville, CA 96130

The Honorable Jackie Lacey
Los Angeles County District Attorney
210 West Temple Street, Suite 18000
Los Angeles, CA 90012

The Honorable David Linn
Madera County District Attorney
209 West Yosemite Avenue
Madera, CA 93637

The Honorable Edward Berberian
Marin County District Attorney
3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 130
San Rafael, CA 94903

The Honorable Thomas Cooke
Mariposa County District Attorney
5101 Jones Street, P.O. Box 730
Mariposa, CA 95338

The Honorable C. David Eyster
Mendocino County District Attorney
100 North State Street, P.O. Box 1000
Ukiah, CA 95482

The Honorable Larry Morse II
Merced County District Attorney
550 W. Main Street
Merced, CA 95340

The Honorable Jordan Funk
Modoc County District Attorney
204 S. Court Street, Suite 202
Alturas, CA 96101

The Honorable Tim Kendall
Mono County District Attorney
P.O. Box 617
Bridgeport, CA 93517

The Honorable Dean Flippo
Monterey County District Attorney
P.O. Box 1131
Salinas, CA 93902

The Honorable Gary Lieberstein
Napa County District Attorney
Carithers Building
931 Parkway Mall
P.O. Box 720
Napa, CA 94559

The Honorable Clifford Newell
Nevada County District Attorney
201 Commercial Street
Nevada City, CA 95959

The Honorable Tony Rackauckas
Orange County District Attorney
401 Civic Center Drive West
Santa Ana, CA 92701

The Honorable R. Scott Owens
Placer County District Attorney
10810 Justice Center Drive, Suite 240
Roseville, CA 95678

The Honorable David Hollister
Plumas County District Attorney
520 Main Street, Room 404
Quincy, CA 95971

The Honorable Michael Hestrin
Riverside County District Attorney
3960 Orange Street
Riverside, CA 92501

The Honorable Anne Marie Schubert
Sacramento County District Attorney
901 G Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Candice Hooper
San Benito County District Attorney
419 4th Street, Second Floor
Hollister, CA 95203

The Honorable Michael Ramos
San Bernardino County District Attorney
303 West 3rd Street, 6th Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0502

The Honorable Bonnie Dumanis
San Diego County District Attorney
330 W. Broadway Street
San Diego, CA 92101

The Honorable George Gascon
San Francisco County District Attorney
850 Bryant Street, Room 322
San Francisco, CA 94103

The Honorable Tori Verber Salazar
San Joaquin County District Attorney
222 East Weber Avenue, Room 202
Stockton, CA 95201

The Honorable Dan Dow
San Luis Obispo County District Attorney
1035 Palm Street, 4th Floor
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

The Honorable Stephen Wagstaffe
San Mateo County District Attorney
400 County Center, Third Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

The Honorable Joyce Dudley
Santa Barbara County District Attorney
1112 Santa Barbara Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

The Honorable Jeffrey Rosen
Santa Clara County District Attorney
70 West Hedding Street, West Wing
San Jose, CA 95110

The Honorable Jeff Rosell
Santa Cruz County District Attorney
701 Ocean Street, Room 200
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

The Honorable Stephen Carlton
Shasta County District Attorney
1355 West Street
Redding, CA 96001

The Honorable Lawrence Allen
Sierra County District Attorney
100 Courthouse Square
Downieville, CA 95936

The Honorable James Kirk Andrus
Siskiyou County District Attorney
P.O. Box 986
Yreka, CA 96097

The Honorable Krishna Abrams
Solano County District Attorney
675 Texas Street, Suite 4500
Fairfield, CA 94533

The Honorable Jill Ravitch
Sonoma County District Attorney
600 Administration Drive, Room 212J
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

The Honorable Birgit Fladager
Stanislaus County District Attorney
832 12th Street, Suite 300
Modesto, CA 95354

The Honorable Amanda Hopper
Sutter County District Attorney
463 Second Street, Suite 102
Yuba City, CA 95991

The Honorable Gregg Cohen
Tehama County District Attorney
444 Oak Street, Room L
Red Bluff, CA 96080

The Honorable Eric Heryford
Trinity County District Attorney
P.O. Box 310
Weaverville, CA 96093

The Honorable Tim Ward
Tulare County District Attorney
221 South Mooney Boulevard,
Rm 224
Visalia, CA 93291-4593

The Honorable Laura Krieg
Tuolumne County District Attorney
423 North Washington Street
Sonora, CA 95370

The Honorable Gregory Totten
Ventura County District Attorney
800 South Victoria Avenue
Ventura, CA 93009

The Honorable Jeff Reisig
Yolo County District Attorney
301 Second Street
Woodland, CA 95695

The Honorable Patrick McGrath
Yuba County District Attorney
215 Fifth Street
Marysville, CA 95901

The Honorable Mike Feuer
Office of the City Attorney, Los Angeles
800 City Hall East
200 North Main Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

The Honorable James Sanchez
Office of the City Attorney, Sacramento
915 I Street, 4th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Jan Goldsmith
Office of the City Attorney, San Diego
1200 Third Avenue, Suite 1620
San Diego, CA 92101

The Honorable Dennis Herrera
Office of the City Attorney, San
Francisco
1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

The Honorable Richard Doyle
Office of the City Attorney, San Jose
200 East Santa Clara Street, 16th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

Office of the California Attorney General
Proposition 65 Enforcement Reporting
ATTN: Prop 65 Coordinator
1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000
Oakland, CA 94612-0550

APPENDIX A

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as "Proposition 65"). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. Please refer to the statute and OEHHA's implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING THE BASIS FOR THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE NOTICE RELATED TO YOUR BUSINESS, CONTACT THE PERSON IDENTIFIED ON THE NOTICE.

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html>. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001.¹ These implementing regulations are available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65Regs.html>.

WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

The "Proposition 65 List." Under Proposition 65, the lead agency (OEHHA) publishes a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity. Chemicals are placed on the Proposition 65 list if they are known to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm, such as damage to

¹ All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated. The statute, regulations and relevant case law are available on the OEHHA website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>.

female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65_list/Newlist.html.

Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under Proposition 65. Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

Clear and reasonable warnings. A business is required to warn a person before "knowingly and intentionally" exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies. The warning given must be "clear and reasonable." This means that the warning must: (1) clearly say that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed to that chemical. Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

Prohibition from discharges into drinking water. A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (<http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

Grace Periods. Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

Governmental agencies and public water utilities. All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

Businesses with nine or fewer employees. Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all full and part-time employees, not just those present in California.

Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer. For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses “no significant risk.” This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific “No Significant Risk Levels” (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA’s website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question. For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the “no observable effect level” divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA’s website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in a Food. Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant² it must be reduced to the lowest level feasible. Regulations explaining this exemption can be found in Section 25501.

Discharges that do not result in a “significant amount” of the listed chemical entering any source of drinking water. The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a “significant amount” of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not pass into or probably pass into a source of drinking water, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A “significant amount” means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the “no significant risk” level for chemicals that cause cancer or that is 1,000 times below the “no observable effect” level for chemicals that cause reproductive toxicity, if an individual were exposed to that amount in drinking water.

² See Section 25501(a)(4)

HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys. Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. The notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in Section 25903 of Title 27, sections 3100-3103 of Title 11. A private party may not pursue an independent enforcement action under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an enforcement action within sixty days of the notice.

A business found to be in violation of Proposition 65 is subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. In addition, the business may be ordered by a court to stop committing the violation.

A private party may not file an enforcement action based on certain exposures if the alleged violator meets specific conditions. For the following types of exposures, the Act provides an opportunity for the business to correct the alleged violation:

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off-premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;
- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

If a private party alleges that a violation occurred based on one of the exposures described above, the private party must first provide the alleged violator a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form.

A private party may not file an action against the alleged violator for these exposures, or recover in a settlement any payment in lieu of penalties or any reimbursement for costs and attorney's fees, if the notice of violation was served on or after October 5, 2013, and the alleged violator has done *all* of the following within 14 days of being served notice:

- Corrected the alleged violation;
- Agreed to pay a civil penalty of \$500 (subject to change as noted below) to the private party within 30 days; and
- Notified the private party serving the notice in writing that the violation has been corrected.

The written notification to the private-party must include a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form completed by the alleged violator as directed in the notice. On April 1, 2019, and every five years thereafter, the dollar amount of the civil penalty will be adjusted by the Judicial Council based on the change in the annual California Consumer Price Index. The Judicial Council will publish the dollar amount of the adjusted civil penalty at each five-year interval, together with the date of the next scheduled adjustment.

An alleged violator may satisfy these conditions only one time for a violation arising from the same exposure in the same facility or on the same premises. The satisfaction of these conditions does not prevent the Attorney General, a district attorney, a city attorney of a city greater than 750,000 in population, or any full-time city prosecutor with the consent of the district attorney, from filing an enforcement action against an alleged violator. The amount of any civil penalty for a violation shall be reduced to reflect any payment made by the alleged violator for the same alleged violation to a private-party.

A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included with this notice and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html>. The notice is reproduced here: